

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-14, 16-27, 29-30 and 32-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Roberts et al. (U.S. Patent 6,560,633) (hereinafter “Roberts”). As set forth in more detail below, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as to the currently pending claims.

The Roberts reference pertains to a method for creating web services. According to Roberts, instead of hand coding a web service, a template may be created that provides XML definitions (runtime model) of a web service application. The code for the web service application can be generated from the template at runtime. *See, e.g.*, col. 2, lines 35-62. In contrast, Applicants’ claim 1 recites a client accessing a space service according to a schema for the space service, the client selecting a service advertisement from the space service, and the client using information from the selected advertisement to execute the corresponding service. The teachings of Roberts regarding runtime generation of a web service application from an XML template have virtually no relevance to claim 1.

More specifically, Roberts does not teach a client accessing a space service according to a schema for the space service, wherein the space service is configured to provide functions to manage or access the one or more service advertisements in the space, wherein the functions of the space service are invoked according to the schema for the space service which specifies one or more messages for invoking functions of the space service, and wherein the schema specifies messages usable to read advertisements from the space and publish advertisements in the space. In regard to the space service of claim 1, the Examiner refers to the web services directory of Roberts. However, Roberts describes its web services directory as a database of the templates that are used to build the runtime models for web service applications (col. 4, lines 46-50; col. 5, lines 43-45). Roberts’ web services directory is not a space service accessed by a client according to a schema, wherein the schema specifies messages usable to read advertisements from the

space. The only schema described in Roberts is an XML schema that is used to interpret the data in the XML runtime model to generate a web service application (col. 4, lines 12-20). The XML schema in Roberts is clearly not a schema that specifies one or more messages for invoking functions of the space service including messages usable by a client to read advertisements from the space, as recited in claim 1. There is absolutely no teaching whatsoever in Roberts that a client accesses the web services directory according to a schema that specifies one or more messages for invoking functions of the web services directory. An XML schema as used in Roberts does not specify messages usable by a client for accessing a service.

Furthermore, Roberts does not teach a client selecting a service advertisement from the space, and the client using the information from the selected service advertisement to execute the corresponding service. The Examiner refers to the description in Roberts of a requester generating an HTTP request to run a “model-based” web service. However, the requester in Roberts does not select an advertisement from a space of a space service, wherein the advertisement comprises information which is usable to access a corresponding service. Nor does the requester in Roberts use the information from the selected service advertisement to execute the corresponding service. The runtime models in Roberts are not used by clients. Instead, the runtime models are used by the web services engine to generate a web service application.

Similar arguments apply in regard to claims 14 and 26.

Furthermore, in regard to claim 14, Roberts does not teach that a first service is operable to send a message according to the schema for the space service to publish a service advertisement with the space service, wherein the service advertisement comprises information which is usable to access the first service. The web services in Roberts clearly do not send any messages to a space service. There is clearly no teaching in Roberts of a service that sends a message to a space service according to a schema for the space service to publish a service advertisement for the service that comprises information which is usable to access the service.

In regard to claim 39, Roberts does not teach storing a set of information in a space by sending at least one message specified in a schema for the space, wherein the schema specifies a plurality of messages usable to invoke functions of the space. Roberts describes the templates of runtime models in a web services directory. However, the templates of runtime models in Roberts are clearly not stored by sending a message specified by a schema to invoke a function of the space. As described above, the XML schemas of Roberts define how XML data should be interpreted. The XML schemas in Roberts have absolutely nothing to do with specifying messages for invoking functions of a space.

Further in regard to claim 39, Roberts does not teach a client retrieving the set of information from the space by sending at least one of the messages specified in the schema for the space. In Roberts, clients do not communicate according to any particular messages specified by a schema. Furthermore, clients in Roberts do not retrieve information from a space. The HTTP requests referred to in Roberts trigger the operation of Roberts web services architecture to perform a runtime generation of a web service application. A client in Roberts does not send a message according to a schema to retrieve a set of information stored from a space.

Arguments similar to those present above in regard to claim 39 also apply to claims 43 and 47.

Applicants also note that numerous ones of the dependent claims are further distinguishable over Roberts. For example, Roberts does not teach that each advertisement stored in the space comprises a URI and schema, as recited in claim 9. Nor does Roberts teach generating results in response to the client executing the corresponding service for the selected service advertisement for the client; and publishing the results in a network-addressable location, wherein information usable to access the network-addressable location is provided in an advertisement for the network addressable-location, as recited in claim 12. Nor does Roberts teach the instantiation

request, lease and gate limitations as recited in claim 13. The sections of Roberts cited by the Examiner for these claims appear to have virtually no relevance whatsoever to the limitations of these claims.

Applicants note that this is the fourth consecutive non-final office action received for this application. Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 707.02, Applicants request that the application be handled expeditiously and be reviewed by a Supervisory Patent Examiner. Applicants' attorney is available at 512-853-8850 to discuss the application in order to expedite prosecution.

Form PTO-1449:

Applicants note that one of the references on one of the forms PTO-1449 returned by the Examiner was not initialed. Specifically, the reference designated A27 was not initialed. Included herewith is a copy of the form PTO-1449 returned by the Examiner listing reference A27. Applicants request the Examiner to carefully consider this reference and properly initial the form PTO-1449, and return a copy to Applicants.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicants hereby petition for such extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-67400/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- Return Receipt Postcard
- Notice of Change of Address
- Fee Authorization Form authorizing a deposit account debit in the amount of \$ for fees ().
- Copy of form PTO-1449 listing reference A27.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzl, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: October 16, 2003